



Iatrogenic vCJD from surgical instruments

Adam Frosh, Rachel Joyce and Alan Johnson

BMJ 2001;322:1558-1559
doi:10.1136/bmj.322.7302.1558

Updated information and services can be found at:
<http://bmj.com/cgi/content/full/322/7302/1558>

These include:

References

5 online articles that cite this article can be accessed at:
<http://bmj.com/cgi/content/full/322/7302/1558#otherarticles>

Rapid responses

5 rapid responses have been posted to this article, which you can access for free at:
<http://bmj.com/cgi/content/full/322/7302/1558#responses>

You can respond to this article at:
<http://bmj.com/cgi/eletter-submit/322/7302/1558>

Email alerting service

Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article - sign up in the box at the top left of the article

Notes

To order reprints follow the "Request Permissions" link in the navigation box

To subscribe to *BMJ* go to:
<http://resources.bmj.com/bmj/subscribers>

much remains to be done merely to catch up with fields such as cancer, cardiovascular disease, and infection.

Lack of data is not the sole cause of patchy and often ineffectual efforts to prevent injury. Pless has highlighted a paradox: preventive efforts are often directed at diseases for which the means of prevention are of doubtful efficacy, while other conditions (including injuries) for which effective preventive measures are available are often ignored.⁸ Possible reasons include ignorance of the scale of the problem, the mistaken perception that many injuries are "accidental" and therefore unavoidable, the belief that prevention lies outwith the scope of health services, and an absence of political will.

In the end, effective injury prevention requires the wholehearted commitment of governments. Taking a lead from Sweden, the US, Australasia, and parts of Europe have recently pushed injuries higher up the political agenda.⁹ This has been achieved through political lobbying and seeking support from non-governmental sources, including the private and voluntary sectors. The publication of *Injury in America* in 1985 was widely regarded as a turning point in the US¹⁰ and was followed by a surge in funding for injury research and prevention. In 1999 the European Union launched an injury prevention programme, and the World Health Organization has played a part in keeping injury and violence prevention high on the international agenda (www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/).

In contrast, the United Kingdom lags behind in its response to injuries. Although "accidents" have been a stated public health priority since the early 1990s, government commitment to injury prevention has been strong on rhetoric and weak on action. The UK compares well with other European countries in that it has the second lowest overall child injury death rate (after Sweden). These figures, however, conceal a poorer record on specific causes such as pedestrian injuries.¹¹ Moreover, deaths are merely the tip of an injury iceberg that is largely invisible because of the lack of data on incidence, morbidity, and disability.

The political inertia in the UK was challenged in 1998 by a report, *Action on Injury*, published with the help of the Department of Health as a supplement to the journal *Injury Prevention* and supported by a national conference.¹² The report was the initiative of a small group of activists working with the relevant royal colleges and faculties and the Child Accident Prevention Trust. Its aim was to raise the profile of

injury prevention in the UK, and there is some evidence that it succeeded. For example, the white paper on public health in England, published in 1999,¹³ emphasises the need to reduce injuries and accepts that responsibility for strategic leadership lies with the health departments. These developments—along with the Department of Health's recently established task force for England—have heartened the injury prevention community, but they are only a start.

Further progress in the UK will depend mainly on four key measures: the creation of a dedicated agency to implement injury prevention and control programmes, improved injury surveillance, the encouragement of multidisciplinary research, and coordinated multi-sectoral action at local and national levels. Unless the UK acts to prevent injuries, more avoidable death and disability will be the inevitable consequence.

David H Stone *director*

Paediatric Epidemiology and Community Health (PEACH) Unit,
University of Glasgow, Glasgow G3 8SJ (dhs1d@clinmed.gla.ac.uk)

Stephen Jarvis *Donald Court professor of community
child health*

University of Newcastle, Newcastle upon Tyne NE8 1EB

Barry Pless *editor, Injury Prevention*

- 1 Gross CP, Anderson GF, Powe NR. The relation between funding by the national institutes of health and burden of disease. *N Engl J Med* 1999;340:1881-7.
- 2 Murray CJL, Lopez AD. Mortality by cause for eight regions of the world: Global Burden of Disease Study. *Lancet* 1997;349:1269-76.
- 3 Murray CJL, Lopez AD. Alternative projections of mortality and disability by cause 1990-2020: Global Burden of Disease Study. *Lancet* 1997;349:1498-1504.
- 4 World Health Organization. *World health statistics annual*. Geneva: WHO, 1991.
- 5 Roberts I, Campbell F, Hollis S, Yates D. Reducing accident death rates in children and young adults: the contribution of hospital care. *BMJ* 1996;313:1239-41.
- 6 Unicef. *A league table of child deaths by injury in rich nations. Innocenti report card No 2*. Florence, Unicef Innocenti Research Centre, 2001.
- 7 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and National Center for Health Statistics. *Proceedings of the International Collaborative effort on Injury Statistics Volume III*. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, 2000.
- 8 Pless B. Action on injury: setting the agenda for children and young people in the UK. *Injury Prevention* 1998;4(suppl):S1-3.
- 9 Bergman AB, Rivara FP. Sweden's experience in reducing childhood injuries. *Pediatrics* 1991;88:69-74.
- 10 Baker S. The United States experience: *Injury in America*. *Injury Prevention* 1998;4(suppl):S4-6.
- 11 Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions. *Tomorrow's roads: safer for everyone*. London: DETR, 2000.
- 12 Pless B, Townner E, eds. *Action on injury. Setting the agenda for children and young people in the UK*. London: BMJ Books, 1998.
- 13 Department of Health. *Saving lives: our healthier nation*. London: Stationery Office, 1999 (Cm 4386).

Iatrogenic vCJD from surgical instruments

The risk is unknown, but improved decontamination will help reduce the risk

Because of fears about iatrogenic transmission of new variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease (vCJD), the Department of Health recently announced fundamental changes in surgical practice, and in particular the practice of ear, nose, and throat surgery. Decontamination facilities in hospitals are to be upgraded, and by the end of 2001 all adenotonsillectomy procedures will be performed using disposable instruments.¹ Why are these measures necessary?

At present both the prevalence of subclinical vCJD and its degree of infectivity via surgical instruments are unknown. Also, no cases of iatrogenic vCJD in humans have so far been identified. Nevertheless, based on the evidence we do have, we can make judgments about the features that are likely to affect the size of the risk from surgical instruments.

So far the disease marker (and likely transmissible agent) for vCJD (PrP^{Sc}) has been identified by sensitive

BMJ 2001;322:1558-9

western blot techniques in the neural and lymphoreticular tissues of brain, tonsil, and spleen.² A positive appendix (which consists largely of lymphoreticular tissue) has not yet been reported using this technique, though one archived appendix has been reported to be positive using immunohistochemical staining.³

There is clear evidence from case reports in humans and animal models that prion diseases can be transmitted via stainless steel instruments.^{4,5} Also the infective agent of iatrogenic prion diseases has shown remarkable resistance to the conventional sterilisation techniques used for surgical instruments.⁶ The incubation period of vCJD is unknown but could be several decades,⁷ so it is therefore unlikely that any iatrogenic cases will have yet emerged. The precautionary principle suggests that when the potential risk to public health is substantial there is no case for sitting back to wait for indisputable evidence. This view has influenced the British government's previous decision to leucodeplete all blood and blood products.⁸

So what is the purpose of the new policy to upgrade decontamination facilities?

The most effective generic approach to preventing vCJD transmission is thought to be to remove all traces of organic material at the washing phase of the decontamination process (washing, disinfection, and sterilisation).⁶ Some decontamination facilities in British hospitals are relatively old, and upgrading them should enable more effective decontamination. This should reduce the risk of transmission of vCJD and of other (including unknown) diseases. Measures are also being introduced to enable all reusable surgical instrument sets to be traced.⁹

Why won't these general measures do for adenotonsillectomy and why must this procedure, specifically, be performed with disposable instruments? We know through animal models that PrP^{Sc} becomes positive in lymphoreticular tissues relatively early in the incubation period.¹⁰ The population undergoing adenotonsillectomy is young (median age 9 years) and has a further life expectancy of about 65 years. Even if vCJD has an incubation period of several decades, the potential impact of iatrogenic transmission to children is particularly serious. Tonsillectomy and adenoidectomy are common operations (about 69 000 were performed in the UK in 1999-2001¹¹). The instrument sets are reused often, and their time in service often exceeds 10 years. Therefore, each set of instruments will over its lifetime have come into contact with many patients, significantly increasing the risk of contamination. In this situation, even if the relative risk is low, the population attributable risk is probably high. This attributable risk reflects the potential numbers of patients who could be affected. If the prevalence of preclinical disease is, say, 1 in 10 000, then about 30% of ear, nose, and throat units could have a contaminated instrument set in the operating theatre.¹² This risk is likely to be increased as instruments tend to "wander" across to other instrument sets with time.

By contrast, patients undergoing lymph node excisions and neurosurgery are usually older and have generally shorter life expectancies. PrP^{Sc} is expressed in neural tissue relatively late in the incubation period, and neurosurgical operations are performed on fewer patients. Compared with the population undergoing

adenotonsillectomy, these patients are likely to have a lower attributable risk.

The case for disposable instruments in appendicectomy remains less clear. So far, the evidence that the appendix is a reliable site for abnormal prion expression is weaker than for tonsils, with only a single case reported with positive immunohistochemistry. However, this operation shares many of the risk attributes of tonsillectomy in that the patient population is otherwise healthy and young and the operation is common.

The Department of Health has worked closely with the British Association of Otorhinolaryngologists-Head and Neck Surgeons to determine the feasibility of using disposable instruments for adenotonsillectomy and in implementing the changes. Although we cannot guarantee that the likely transmissible agent of vCJD will be completely eliminated by the proposed changes in decontamination of surgical instruments, any improvement on the present system is likely to reduce the potential infectious load. If the infectivity is dose related, then this generic approach, together with the specific use of disposable instruments for adenotonsillectomy, should reduce the attributable risk to the population, and is therefore welcome.

Adam Frosh *consultant ENT surgeon*

Lister Hospital, Stevenage, Herts SG1 4AB (a.frosh@btinternet.com)

Rachel Joyce *senior registrar, public health medicine*

South Thames Public Health Rotation, St George's Hospital, London SW17 0RE

Alan Johnson *consultant ENT surgeon and honorary secretary*

British Association of Otorhinolaryngologists-Head and Neck Surgeons (BAOHNS), Royal College of Surgeons of England, London WC2A 3PE

AF was involved in developing the Exmoor disposable tonsillectomy kit, originally designed to confirm diagnosis of clinically suspected cases of vCJD in living patients by tonsil biopsy.

- 1 Department of Health. £200 million for NHS equipment to protect patients against possible variant CJD risk. London: DoH, 2001 (press release 2001/0012).
- 2 Hill AF, Butterworth RJ, Joiner S, Jackson G, Rosser MN, Thomas DJ, et al. Investigation of variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease and other human prion diseases with tonsil biopsy samples. *Lancet* 1999;353:183-9.
- 3 Hilton D, Fathers E, Edwards P, Ironside J, Zajicek J. Prion immunoreactivity in appendix before clinical onset of variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease. *Lancet* 1998;352:703-4.
- 4 Bernoulli C, Siegfried J, Baumgartner G, Regli F, Rabinowicz T, Gajdusek DC, et al. Danger of accidental person-to-person transmission of Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease by surgery. *Lancet* 1977;1:478-9.
- 5 Zobeley E, Flechsig E, Corrizio A, Enari M, Weissman C. Infectivity of scrapie prions bound to a stainless steel surface. *Mol Med* 1999;5:240-3.
- 6 Advisory Committee on Dangerous Pathogens and Spongiform Encephalopathy Advisory Committee. *Transmissible spongiform encephalopathy agents: safe working and the prevention of infection*. London, Stationery Office, 1998.
- 7 Collinge J. Variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease. *Lancet* 1999;354:317-23.
- 8 Horton R. The new new public health of risk and radical engagement. *Lancet* 1998;352:251-2.
- 9 Department of Health. *Decontamination of medical devices*. Health Service Circular 2000/032.
- 10 Fraser H, Bruce M, Davies D, Farguhar C, McBride P. The lymphoreticular system in the pathogenesis of scrapie. In: Prusiner S, Collinge J, Powell J, Anderton B, eds. *Prion diseases of humans and animals*. London: Ellis Horwood, 1992:308-317.
- 11 Department of Health. *Hospital in-patient data based on hospital episode statistics, England 1999/00*. http://www.doh.gov.uk/hes/standard_data/available_tables/main_operations/index.html. 2000.
- 12 Frosh A. Prions and the ENT surgeon. *J Laryngology Otolaryngology* 1999;113:1064-7.